

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed March 22, 2010. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 1-42 remain pending as amended above.

Initially, objection to the abstract is believed to be moot via the above-detailed amendments to the abstract.

35 USC § 112 Rejection of the Claims

Rejection of claims 1-42 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, are believed to be moot. More particularly, to expedite prosecution of the present application, all instances of “permit” and “selectively” have been removed (even in claims not specifically rejected).

35 USC §§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 18-19, 21-22, 27-30 and 35-36 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dice et al. (US Patent Publication No. 20040025160 A1).

Claims 3-6, 9-17, 20, 23-26, 31-34 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dice et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0025160 A1) in view of Benson et al. (US Patent No. 5,542,076).

Claims 37-42 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dice et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0025160 A1) in view of Nolan et al. (US Patent No. 6,446,141).

Initially, each of these rejections is respectfully traversed as the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or even suggest the claimed combination of features such as set forth in any of the pending claims.

Without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, only in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to in part recite that “the thread is to avoid disabling all interrupts before it enters the first critical region and avoid re-enabling the interrupts after exiting the first critical region”. Support for this amendment may be readily found in the present specification, see, e.g., the Specification at paragraphs 34, 35, 39, and 47.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach (or even suggest) the claimed combination of features such as set forth in claim 1, including for example, a thread not having to disable all interrupts prior to entering a critical regions (and subsequently having to re-enable all threads when exiting the critical region), which can make other parts of the program that depend on interrupts become virtually non-deterministic with regard to response time because their interrupts may occur while a thread is

operating in a critical region (see, e.g., paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Specification). Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The remaining independent claims recite similar (though not identical) language as claim 1 and have been rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. Hence, these remaining independent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (303-800-6678) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Applicant hereby petitions, as well as includes the appropriate fee herewith, to obtain a one-month extension of the period for responding to the Office action, thereby moving the deadline for response from June 22, 2010 to July 22, 2010.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,
CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890
Telephone Number: 303-800-6678

Date 7/22/10 By /Ramin Aghevli – Reg. No. 43,462/
Ramin Aghevli, Reg. No. 43,462